DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 805 LI 004 253

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Harvey, John F. |
| TITLE | Iranian Vs. American Library Serial Selection Policies. |
| PUB DATE | 26 Jun 71 |
| NOTE | 18p.; (0 References) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Comparative Analysis; Foreign Countries; Information Centers; *Library Acquisition; Library Science; *Serials; University Libraries |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Iran; United States |

ABSTRACT

This essay attempts to compare and contrast certain Iranian and American library serial selection policies. It assumes that many similarities exist between the selection policies of the two countries, but that special problems and contrasts exist in each one, also. The paper concentrates on the policies of two specific institutions, Drexel University, previously, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A., and the Iranian Documentation Centre (Irandoc), Tehran, Iran. One is an academic library, the other a government agency documentation center. They are alike in some striking ways but are very different in others. In spite of the absence of data and analyses needed to support an objective study, the author draws two conclusions based on his personal observation and experience. The influence of nationalism on serial subscription policies in Iran and America must be recognized. Probably it is common in libraries over the world to find large numbers of local titles on hand. Also, whenever local pride or nationalism and strong library service ideas are combined, then a rich representation of local serials may be expected, as a way of providing good service to local users. (LI 004244 through 004252 and LI 004254 through 004267 are related.) (Author/SJ)

[ERIC User Note: Best Copy Available.]

# IRANIAN VS. AMERICAN LIBRARY SERIAL SELECTION POLICIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 073805

LI 004 253

This essay attempts to compare and contrast certain Iranian and American library serial selection policies. It assumes many similarities to exist between the selection policies of the two countries, but that special problems and contrasts exist in each one, also. The paper concentrates on the policies of two specific institutions, Drexel University, previously, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, USA, and the Iranian Documentation Centre (Irandoc), Tehran, Iran. One was an academic library, the other a government agency documentation center. They were alike in some striking ways but were very different in others. The author was an administrative staff member of both organizations though several years separated his service in them. The data were gathered by observation and the personal experience from which this essay springs.

Drexel was a private technical university with schools of engineering, science, business administration, library science, home economics and evening studies, the latter concentrating on engineering. It had eleven thousand students and one thousand faculty and staff members. Doctoral programs had been started recently in seven engineering and science departments, but the institution was primarily undergraduate. The Drexel Library had fifty full-time staff members and an annual budget of $500,000.

The Iranian Documentation Centre was a national scientific and technical information centre supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education. Its seventy full-time staff members provided library plus documentation and publication services with an annual budget of $400,000. Developing a large national research library in science and social science was one of its important tasks.

The two material collections were very different in size. In its seventy five years Drexel had accumulated over 200000 volumes, while in its two years Irandoc had collected less than 20000 volumes. Drexel received 3000 current serial titles, and Irandoc received about 4000 serial titles, in both cases, by gift or exchange, but mostly by purchase. Drexel's annual serial budget was $100000 and Irandoc's serial budget was $130,000.

One of Irandoc's first serial selection steps was to work out its material collection emphases. In a formal statement, approved by its executive committee, Irandoc's material needs were established for all subject fields in terms of the Library of Congress subject classification. Four levels of collection size or need were shown: 1) Graduate research collection, 2) Undergraduate major level collection, 3) Introductory collection for university freshmen, 4) No material.

These categories applied to both serials and monographs. The following is a list of the fields for which one or two level collections were felt to be needed:

| | |
|---|---|
| AE | Encyclopedias (1) |
| AG 5-191 | Minor encyclopedias (1) |
| 500-571 | Information Bureaus (2) |
| AI | Indexes (1) |
| AP | Periodicals (2) |
| AS | Academies, Directories (1) |
| CT | Biography (2) |
| G | Geography (2) |
| 1001-3035 | Atlases (1) |
| 101-2396 | Cartography (2) |
| GC | Oceanology (1) |
| GF | Anthropogeography (2) |
| GN 51-686 | Anthropology (2) |
| GV | Sports (2) |
| H | Social Science (2) |
| HA, HB, HE-HJ | Economics (1) and (2) |
| HM-HX | Sociology except HN 30-39, HT 851-1445, HV 4701-5720 (1) and (2) |
| J-JX | Political Science except JL (2) |
| K | Law (1) |
| L-LH | Education except LA (1) |
| NA | Architecture (2) |
| ND 1700-3505 | Home Decoration (2) |
| 8800-9950 | Textiles and Woodwork (2) |
| Q | Science (2) |
| QA-QR | Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Botany, Zoology, Physiology (1) |
| R-RT | Medicine and Related Fields (1) |
| S-SK | Agriculture (1) |
| T-TX | Technology (1) |
| U | Military Science (2) |
| V | Naval Science (2) |
| Z 49-100 | Typing and Shorthand (2) |
| 116-980 | Book Industry, Library Science (2) and (1) |
| 1001-1100 | Bibliography (1) |

Drexel had no such formal policy statement, and interpreted its collection interests and intensities broadly from the curricular and research emphasizes of its parent institution. For many years, these interests had been simple and little changed, so they were not difficult to learn and remember. Each instution's serial budget was too small to permit strong collection development outside its primary and secondary interest fields.

Serial selection was organized differently in the two organizations. Irandoc routed large numbers of bibliographic and review titles to its reference staff members for use in book and serial selection. Drexel did this, also, but in a somewhat different manner. Serials were sent from the serial record section to the reading rooms by way of the Drexel subject reference librarians' offices. If they wished to read and do selection before sending them to the shelves, they could. Usually, the serials were used for this purpose, at least certain titles among them.

Irandoc had a formally organized serial evaluation committee, also, consisting of the chief reference librarian, who was chairman, the technical advisor, and the subject bibliographers. Each committee meeting was held with one of four subcommittees organized by subject: the physical sciences including engineering, the biological sciences including medicine and agriculture, the social sciences including business and law, and finally, the fields of education, library science and general subjects. Each subcommittee consisted of two professional subject

bibliographers with bachelors, masters, or doctors degrees in the appropriate subject fields. In addition, two assistant reference librarians and another subprofessional were occasional committee members.

Sample copies of specific titles were selected for the committee's consideration from the serial stacks or else from gift and exchange items recently arrived. The committee met weekly in the chairman's office to evaluate a stack of titles in one of the four subject areas. Each title was inspected by those present who voted democratically on them. They voted to keep and bind the titles thought to be essential (KB-1); important titles, indexed in a serial indexing service and reporting research results, but not considered essential, were rated somewhat lower (KB-2); less important material was kept without binding for one or two years and then discarded, (K-2 or K-1); and unimportant material was cancelled (cd).

The KB-2 category was established with the expectation of future budget cuts which might require cancelling all subscriptions except those in the KB-1 category composed of indexing and abstracting services and source titles indexed widely. Most "keep one year" or "keep two years" material was of marginal research value but was free and contained short research papers or useful news. Material cancelled was out of scope, ephemeral, in a language not widely understood in Iran, indexed, expensive, or duplicated elsewhere in Tehran. A copy of Ulrich, International Periodical Directory, was kept handy for committee consultation. Unfortunately, correlating serial subscription decisions with the serial budget was almost impossible.

Drexel serial selection organization was much more informal and relaxed. Irandoc made a deliberate attempt to seek out and evaluate every title currently on hand as well as a large number of titles not readily available, but no such attempt was made at Drexel. Probably, this contrast related to the two countries' character and personality differences and to the differences between two year old and seventy year old organizations. Drexel had a good serial collection already and did not feel the need to select large numbers of new titles. There was no separate serial or book evaluation committee. Nor was a formal recorded decision available on any serial title, though an annual check of serial renewal lists provided the occasion for adding or dropping a few titles. Selection was in the hands of the four assistant reference librarians, one of each covering the humanities and home economics, business administration and the social sciences, engineering and science, and finally, library science. Whenever one of these librarians saw a desirable title listed, he sent to the chief reference librarian a note reques-

ting its purchase. Selection might be made after checking serial index lists, reading advertisements received in the mail, or checking the citation in a new monograph. Certain titles required conversation with faculty members, and sometimes they suggested titles, also. If approval was obtained, this information was forwarded to the serial record section. If the budget permitted, the title was added to the subscription list for the coming year.

Irandoc's five most important broad subject areas were medicine, engineering, agriculture, education and bibliography. Within these fields, civil engineering, and particularly, road building were much more important than aeronautical or chemical engineering, just as gastroentrology was more important than psychiatry, for instance. Because of Irandoc's location in the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, higher was more important than elementary or secondary education. Sociology, statistics and economics were of some interest, but generally, as in other developing Asian nations, the social sciences were of much less concern than science and technology and involved far fewer students, faculty members, government and business people. Since Irandoc was part of an institute of research, also, many titles were selected in research management, legislation and techniques. Generally speaking, any serial with the words, international, developing or comparative in its title was more interesting than one with merely national scope. With international titles, Iran had a chance of learning something directly helpful from the contents, whereas most of the articles in national titles seemed to be only remotely related to Iran. Since the University of Tehran Department of Library Science had little or no budget for material, and since staff and profession-wide education was a major responsibility, Irandoc needed to purchase strongly in bibliography, library and information science for the benefit of Iran's new library profession.

Several other subject emphases or limitations related closely to the national personality characteristics of Iranians. Subjects in which they had a special interest included (a) carpets, though serials on machine-made or synthetic carpets were vetoed, (b) roses, in fact a strong interest existed in gardens and horticulture in general, (c) adult literacy material, important in a half literate nation, (d) planned parenthood, vital for a high birth rate oriental country, (e) petroleum, because of Iran's heavy economic dependence on it, (f) West Asia in general, of considerable concern if not interest, (g) irrigation, dams, and water power, vital topics to an arid agricultural nation, (h) rice, tea, dates, pistachios, and sugar, if only because they were Iranian diet staples, (i) desert

studies of all kinds were important to desert dwellers, as was (j) land reform, while (k) wool was an important export commodity, and (l) handicrafts were tourist trade items, but only those which were traditionally Iranian. None of these subjects was of any significant concern to Drexel, however.

Many subjects were of little interest to Iran, sometimes of surprisingly little interest. One of these subjects was oceanography. For a nation with seas at both ends, Iran had surprisingly little concern for marine subjects. Material was selected in this field anyhow, against the awakening of interest in the future. Much the same picture held for mining, also, subject for the future. The pure aspects of such subjects as physics, chemistry, mathematics, economics, political science, and astronomy were much less interesting and useful than their applied aspects. Meteorology was more useful than astronomy, engineering than mathematics, seismology than physics, industrial testing than design theory, pesticides than botany, commerce than economics, law than political science. Iran was very pragmatic. Public administration, one of Iran's great problem areas, was of little interest. Home economics and nutrition were little known fields in family-centered Iran. Likewise, physical education was poorly developed, modern business administration not much better. Interestingly enough, Drexel agreed with most of these negative views, but disagreed strongly on two of the last three of of them.

In general, the subject emphasis conformation was surprisingly similar at Drexel, humanities being of little interest, social science of more interest, while science, and particularly applied science, were of paramount interest. Drexel was basically an engineering school, more than half of its students being in such day or evening curricula, and its engineering material holdings were extensive. It had no medical, agricultural, education, or law curricula, nor any majors in the humanities, history, physical education, theology or architecture. On the other hand, business administration was of strong interest -- personnel, accounting, finance, management, investment, office machines -- since a professional school existed in that field. The basic sciences of chemistry and physics were of strong interest, too, because research-oriented departments had developed there. Biology and mathematics were of modest Drexel interest as were such social science fields as sociology, political science and economics where small elective departments existed.

Considerable material was selected for the other professional schools, also, those in library science and home economics. Drexel's collections therein were expected to the best in Philadelphia, one of North America's largest book centers, because

no other strong Philadelphia schools existed in these subject fields. Library science students used the library heavily and required some duplication of material, even serials. Most of the titles covered in Library Literature were on the subscription list. For home economics, the clothing, design, nutrition, cook book, foods, consumer, and personal finance collections were extensive. Even a few expensive art periodicals were purchased for home economics use, though no art major existed.

Among more specialized and peripheral fields, Drexel purchased some local Philadelphia titles in order to keep current with activites in its immediate area, the same reason being valid for Irandoc's local titles. However, Philadelphians had a greater interest and pride in their home area than did most educated Tehranis, even though the latter were quite nationalistic. Irandoc subscribed to almost no recreational serials, the sober and formal approach to be expected of Iranians. Philadelphians, living in a more relaxed and leisure-oriented nation, felt an obligation to provide recreational material for students and faculty members. Therefore, it selected a number of popular American and British humor, sports, fashion, picture, and literary titles, most of them in the humanities.

Irandoc selected a very few humanities and historical titles because they contained some science or social science interest, also, but Drexel included some historical material for its students taking history electives and for others wishing to read general interest material. America's high literacy rate and strong interest in communication brought forth a flood of serials of all kinds and descriptions to chose from, in contrast to Iran's thin collection.

Drexel's individual characteristics emphasized (a) a collection aimed at men, since a majority of the students and faculty members were male, (b) generally, a practical collection, since all of Drexel's schools emphasized applied rather than theoretical fields, (c) a serial collection of medium size, since Drexel's budget and research emphases were still modest, and (d) a collection of major and minor gaps as it followed the Drexel curriculum, with humanities being so poorly represented, social sciences skewed strongly toward business administration, and engineering overwhelming the other sciences and technologies. Irandoc reflected a similar picture as that given in (a) above because of the male-dominated Iranian society, certainly agreed with Drexel on (b) practically, reluctantly on (c) for the same reasons, and on (d) as well, though not quite in the same way, agriculture, medicine, and education, for instance, being among Irandoc's most important fields.

A librarian was always inclined to think of local serials and of those aimed at users much like the local group as being essential to his holdings. Irandoc and Drexel agreed with this generalization. In each country, interest was directed first toward the serials of the library's own country. It was assumed that most of Drexel's serial titles would be American, although the author cannot remember discussing the problem at any time. American serials were most easily accessible, assumed to be of excellent quality, and best represented in the serial indexes at hand. A large number of useful and good quality American titles was assumed to exist in any field, in fact, usually more than Drexel could afford. Only the most important foreign titles were thought to be worth purchasing, and little money could be spared for them anyhow.

Most of Irandoc's staff believed Asian titles to be universally poor, African, Oceanic and South American titles almost non-existant, European titles excellent, American titles good and Canadian titles mediocre. Nevertheless, Irandoc was much less provincial than Drexel in seeking titles from a variety of countries. Its holdings included representatives of all continents and of countries from the capitalist, socialist, and developing worlds. Irandoc's first interest was in selecting Iranian serial titles or at least those aimed at an Iranian audience, however. Its collection of Iranian science and social science serial titles was quite comprehensive, in fact, a majority of all such Iranian titles published were on its shelves, 350 altogether. The fact that it was part of Irandoc's mission to index and abstract the better Iranian serial material, the low or else free price attached to most titles, and the responsibility of a central national government agency to collect, preserve and service local material comprehensively, since no other agency was doing this, were all reasons for Irandoc's comprehensive coverage of it. Of course, Irandoc's coverage of local Tehran titles was even more comprehensive than was its coverage of Iranian titles as a whole. This intra-national selectivity was caused by the lower quality of many provincial titles as well as by the difficulty of identifying and obtaining them.

It was doubtful that Drexel had titles from more than a dozen countries, mostly capitalist countries plus the Soviet Union, nor that other countries provided more than 5% of its total subscription list. The corresponding figures for Irandoc were 55-60 countries and 90%. Drexel's coverage of American titles was poor in terms of percentage, perhaps 1% being represented, and presumably only the best of the appropriate titles being included. On the other hand, Irandoc subscribed to almost 100% of the appropriate Iranian titles.

Language was an important selection criterion in both countries. At Drexel, the East Asian languages, for instance, were almost completely unknown, so no titles were received in them. African languages were given no consideration, either. Russian was almost as mysterious, and material in that language was thought to be useable by almost no one on the campus, except in cover-to-cover translations. French and German, on the other hand, were assumed to be intelligible to many users and were seldom regarded as deterents to selection. Several significant titles were received in these languages and given some use. Eastern European languages were seldom considered, thought to be rather remote and unintelligible, and to represent third rate literature. The Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands were thought to publish primarily in French, German or English, so representation in their own languages was considered unnecessary. Spanish was considered suspect for the quality of its scientific literature, but the language itself was not regarded as a selection deterent. Even so, little interest existed in Latin America or in Spain, so few titles were received. Italian and Portuguese were less useful and were thought to include few first class scientific titles. Such West Asian languages as Hebrew, Turkish, Greek, and Ordu were not even considered. Arabic and Persian were unintelligible to staff members and users, their serial titles unknown, unrepresented and unmissed.

At the Iranian Documentation Centre, language was an even greater limiting factor. Persian serial material was of top priority, although its quality was said by Irandoc bibliographers to be third rate. This low opinion of its usefulness was almost universal and led many Iranian scientists to publish abroad and read foreign serials only. Afghan Persian language titles, on the other hand, were both hard to locate and even harder to defend to Iranians qualitatively. Surprisingly, Arabic language serials were considered to be useless, since only a very small minority of educated Iranians could read them. The writing script closely resembled that of the Persian language, and some words were recognizable, but most of them were not. Of course, Armenian, Ordu, Kurdish and Turkish were spoken by small Iranian minorities, also, but except for Turkish, their scientific literature was almost non-existant, and the demand for material in these languages was nil. No other East or West Asian languages were read or spoken widely in Iran, so none were represented more than minimally in serial selection. African languages ditto.

As for European languages, several staff members and users read French, so many serial titles were selected in that language, in which scholarly titles were numerous. In addition to research serials, the CNRS abstract bulletin series was

well represented in the index and abstract room. No other European languages were understood by even a tenth of the users or reference staff members, however, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Russian, the Scandinavian languages, and the East European languages, all being in this category. Only German and Italian were represented by more than a few titles, perhaps 10-20 for each one of them. German was taught regularly in certain secondary schools, was popular with some technical students and was Iran's fourth or fifth ranking language. Italian was the foreign language of many Iranian architects and was represented in that field.

Of course, these negative statements about their languages do not mean that Asia, Europe, Africa and the Americas were unrepresented in Irandoc's serial collection. Surprisingly, numbers of English language serials were published on these continents, and some of them were considered useful enough to be included in serial indexes. The largest number of titles approved for Irandoc subscription, perhaps three fourths of the total, were in English, and roughly half of them were neither American nor British, but came from any of fifty different countries.

Reading level was a matter of concern in both places, though in somewhat different ways. The Tehran situation was more complicated than the Philadelphia situation, as should be expected. In Philadelphia, the reading level of most material was high, aimed at researchers. The faculty and student body were assumed to be capable of understanding it. Of course, most recreational material was pitched at a popular level, and certain useful titles were available at an intermediate level, but the latter two title groups were in the minority.

At Irandoc, the percent of serious and scholarly material was even higher. In addition, three other reading level problems existed. First, Irandoc's user group, the group whose reading level was in question, was harder than Drexel's to identify and understand. Drexel had a user group of affiliated, easily definable, and surveyable faculty members and students. While the majority may not have been even moderate users, at least they were formally affiliated and looked to Drexel whenever they needed library service. In contrast, Irandoc had no user group of any kind in close affiliation. In fact, its user group was almost entirely potential rather than actual. Though the Centre had institute and ministry staffs to serve, they were located in other buildings and seemed to have little interest in information service.

Secondly, Iranian students and faculty members had a language reading level problem. Few of them could read any foreign language well, yet most of the useful technical material was available only in a foreign language. Iranians who had the

patience and ability to read long, abstruce English or French language technical articles could be expected to read them at about one third to one half the speed of a native English or French reader.

Thirdly, almost no Iranians had the strength of interest or the capability of understanding the more advanced research material in any field, since few people were doing advanced graduate research. Hence, there was no point in buying it. As a matter of fact, very little research was being carried on at any level. Therefore, Irandoc was required to balance the present situation against the need to start acquiring journals of scholarly respectability to support the research anticipated in a decade or two. A compromise was necessary to exclude those journals which would be too advanced even for the next generation, but to include those journals pitched at more nearly an intermediate level, moderately scholarly, and on more general rather than very specialized topics. Not only was this compromise difficult to understand and apply to scholarly journals, but convincing Irandoc bachelors and masters degree level bibliographers that their professors were capable of using only elementary western research material was almost impossible, also.

As a matter of fact, thousands of undergraduate Iranian students could hardly understand elementary professional papers in their major subject fields. They were seldom required to do very much reading, however. Of course, to some extent, it was true at Drexel, also, that many students had difficulty understanding their assignments, but it seemed not to have been considered there.

Ascertaining the "rightness of fit" between each title and users' needs in subject matter and reading level was difficult in both countries, and matches with defineable groups not always easy to locate. Generally, in both countries, academic and special libraries preferred scholarly to popular level material, so determining the content's scholarliness and even the quality of its scholarliness were part of the selection task. In this way, the National Geographic suffered in comparison with the American Journal of Geography, for instance. Public libraries might select the National Geographic, partly for its popularity as well as its easy reading level, but these factors rarely affected selection positively in either of the two organizations discussed here. Such American titles as Time, Newsweek and Life were early Irandoc selections, but they were indexed in its serial indexing services, also. They could be obtained easily by airmail through a local news agent, though in turn, this was due to the popularity of their newsstand sale.

Data on user needs and interests was not collected thoroughly in either place, nor was it easy to predict their future shifts. At Irandoc, to some extent this was

a matter of trying to predict what the users would grow up to understand. More short run change might have been expected here than in Philadelphia, as the developing country strove to catch up with its western benefactor. However, upon more reflection, probably the opposite was more likely to be true. Tehran was moving forward in scientific knowledge, research and development, but Philadelphia was moving forward much faster and moving even further away from Tehran. Probably it would be many years before their increasing technical sophistication came into phase, and many years after that before Tehran started to overtake Philadelphia.

Irandoc gave strong emphasis to index and abstract services and to serial bibliographies, eventually several hundred of them being on the subscription list. Its collection of current index and abstract titles and bibliographies must have become one of the most extensive in West Asia. Irandoc needed wide coverage, since its subject scope was so broad, and abstract and index services were not only the most basic and useful types of material in these fields, but, at least for certain purposes, each of these fields was reasonably well reperesented by this type of material. Further, if Irandoc's serial budget was to be restricted, as it probably would be sonner or later due to mercurial Iranian government policies, these were the titles to which subscription must be retained, after all else had been cancelled. The reference librarians could carry on literature searches and SDI projects from this material only. International library loan photocopies of entire papers could be obtained easily by airmail from CNRS in Paris, the American NLM, NAL, and the British NLL. The Tehran Book Processing Centre national bibliography collection supplemented this abstract and index collection for book material.

Drexel did not particularly emphasize bibliographic, index or abstract titles, though certainly several dozen of the chief titles in the fields of primary interest were to be found on its subscription list. Basic and heavily used indexes were housed on special index tables in the reference and public catalog area where they could be located easily. However, there was some suspicion on the staff that certain of the new index and abstract journals each year overlapped considerably with existing indexes. Several of them were thought to cost too much and others in certain specialized science fields were expected to receive so little use from students and faculty members as to be hardly worth acquiring.

Coverage of a serial's contents in the library's serial index or abstract journals was very important and determined purchase status for many titles. Index service increased the use to be expected for a title. Further, such a listing separated out one title from others in indicating an editorial board's good opin-

ion of its usefulness. Analytical Chemistry was surely useful to more chemists than was the news bulletin of the New York Chemist Club. Since literature searches were carried out primarily in serial indexes, the non-indexed title had little chance of being listed, even for a bibliography in its own subject field. Titles not so covered were to some extent lost. Abstracted material, and, to some extent even indexed material, could be "read" quickly just by reading the listings and abstracts.

Where the journal stood on citation count lists was significant, also, in showing the impact or citability of its papers. Both index status and citation count ranking were useful items of information in the two countries, though they were given more attention in Iran than in the USA. Each library needed bibliographic material because it was of such basic importance in selection, acquisition, and reference work. In fact, this was probably the most basic serial material of all.

Accuracy and dependability of the serial's contents were important in each country, but were difficult to evaluate in each country, also. Both Drexel and Irandoc had more or less well trained subject specialist reference and bibliographic staff members to carry out the evaluations. Drexel's subject specialists averaged a bachelors degree in their subject fields, and a masters degree in library science, while Irandoc's subject specialists averaged a masters degree in their subject fields and no course work in library science. The national contrasts could be seen most clearly when we attempted to chose American serials for use in Iran and Iranian serials for use in America. Each library had an advantage over the other in evaluating the accuracy and dependability of titles in its own country. Obviously, this left Irandoc the worse off of the two organizations, howeverm because it needed hundreds of American titles, while Drexel needed very few Iranian titles.

The representation of a variety of viewpoints, conservative and liberal, historical and modern, for and against, international and local, popluar and scholarly was often an important factor for consideration at Drexel, seldom in Irandoc. American democratic principles emphasized book selection freedom and the importance of full representation for both sides of any argument. In Iran, a variety of viewpoints existed on many social and political subjects, but they were not much discussed, conformity to official views being expected. For instance, varying attitudes existed toward communist countries, and the ideas of serial selection fairness toward them and curiosity about them were present but were rather dimly perceived. Foreign political problems did not concern Iranians very much.

Censorship was never invoked in either library, but strongly pro-communist material was officially frowned upon by the national government in each country. Generally, Drexel was freer than Irandoc to select material but seldom felt that it needed such freedom. Its parent institution and student body were relatively conservative, and faculty members seldom assigned controversial material. Irandoc, on the other hand, had a security police officer on the staff to check activities, but censorship of all kinds was more potential than actual. We had no trouble retaining a few pro-Chinese communist title subscriptions. However, nationalistic Kurdish material was piled on the discard shelves rather than being made available to the public. Censorship of sexually sophisticated material was not a problem in either city, though little of it was received.

Publishers' reputation was a frequent concern in the USA. Some titles were refused where this reputation was poor and other titles purchased automatically where it was excellent. Since most of its titles were American, Drexel stood a good chance of being able to evaluate publishers. The reputations of foreign serial publishers were much harder to evaluate, though of less consequence, also, because so few foreign titles were obtained. Serial publishers' reputations were much better in the USA than in Iran. High levels of serial content accuracy and dependability were factors in any title's favor, and were common in the USA, just as sensationalism and proof reading errors were common in Iran. Many Iranian titles compounded their own poor reputations by appearing at irregular and undependable intervals.

The publisher's reputation seemed less discriminatory for Iran than for the USA, however, because of Irandoc's comprehensive selection of Iranian serial titles. Here, publishers' reputation was more important for foreign titles. In many countries, it was difficult for Irandoc to guess repute, since few of its staff members knew the Polish publishing world, for instance, or the UAR scholarly journal situation. Usually, guess work was necessary. Of course, at Irandoc and Drexel, most university, research center and national documentation center ~~and national documentation centre~~ publications were assumed to be reliable and probably significant. Government agency publications were assumed to be reliable. For the USA, the UK, and to some extent for France, some publisher's repute information was available on the Irandoc staff, so selection took this knowledge into consideration.

Deliberately, Irandoc stopped retrospective serial purchasing with 1960, except

for important index and abstract titles. Drexel had no policy against retrospective purchasing but did little of it because most of the older volumes needed were already on its shelves. In this instance, institutional practice was quite similar between countries, but for different reasons. Further, Drexel tended to think in terms of complete retrospective files for every serial title, perhaps reflecting the influence of American accreditation standards. Irandoc staff members knew they were unlikely to have the budget to acquire thousands of older backfile volumes, so restricted the vast majority of their purchases to subscriptions beginning with the current year, usually 1969 or 1970. Irandoc emphasized breadth and currency of coverage with little depth, whereas Drexel emphasized depth in certain fields of strong emphasis. Irandoc assumed it would be able to supplement its holdings by obtaining back issues not on hand from other Iranian or foreign sources in its inter-library loan system participation. To some extent, Drexel assumed the same thing, of course.

As its budget was reduced, price was increasingly important in Irandoc's considerations and was not overlooked at Drexel, either. Price was always a factor to measure usefulness against, both for an expensive title like Chemical Abstracts and for a free title like Borden Reviews. Each organization refused opportunities to subscribe for this reason. Those titles published by Springer Verlag, for instance, were noted in both cities always to be expensive and often concentrated on specialized research topics, though they were always of good quality, also. Generally, American and German titles were most expensive, and Indian, Pakistani, and Iranian cheapest.

A much higher percent of Irandoc's than of Drexel's titles were received free of charge, perhaps 40% vs. 10%. Both local and foreign titles came in this manner. However, in this connection, it must be pointed out that there was a significant difference in the quality of the two serial collections, also. Not only did Drexel have many more expensive basic source titles of high quality than did Irandoc, but it had a much richer back file collection, also. Drexel and Irandoc overlap in specific serial title subscriptions was hard to estimate but may have reached one third. Neither library had exchange serials of high quality to offer other libraries, though Irandoc exploited its longer exchange list much more heavily than Drexel did.

Most titles were obtained on paper in both places, though each organization had some microfilm subscriptions for current volumes. Drexel had the larger number

of them and had some serial backfilm, also. Only Drexel had microcard and microfiche serial subscriptions, however.

Of course, periodicals were the most numerous of serial types in both institutions and were the most valuable, also. Continuations were represented in both places, however, and made up perhaps a sixth of Drexel's and a fourth of Irandoc's serial titles. There seemed to be little difference between the continuations of the two organizations, except for Irandoc's larger collection of them, from a greater variety of countries, but from fewer subject fields, also. The generalizations already given for serials in general applied to them equally.

Drexel received newspapers from three or four European capitals as well as Philadelphia, New York and two or three other American cities. Irandoc received Kabul, Karachi, London, Paris, Rome, Berlin and New York newspapers, in addition to a dozen or so papers in three languages from Tehran. Each library had a satisfactory foreign representation in this category of material, but Irandoc had a much stronger local representation than Drexel did.

In their government publications collections, the two centers were quite different. Drexel was a partial depository for US government documents and took a small minority of them. Aside from several British HMSO and UN publications, few other government publications were obtained. Irandoc, on the other hand, made a strong effort to acquire all Iranian government documents and started to prepare a comprehensive index to them. In fact, its collection was expected to be Iran's most comprehensive, and its index to be the only one in existance. Irandoc purchased and secured free of charge several hundred HMSO, GPO, Australian, South African and UN government publication series fitting into its subject fields.

Now that the description and juxtaposition of Drexel University Library and Iranian Documentation Centre serial selection policies have been completed, their analysis and comparison may begin. We must select from the data given above on the two organizations those similarities which seem significant. Contrasts are useless here and insignificant or derivative similarities little better. Also, the important similarities should be explainable in terms of the social and cultural backgrounds from which they spring, or else in terms of the professional theories of the two organizations. Similarities not explainable in such general terms will be of little value to scholars wishing to search for them in other

situations or to generalize from these findings. Many similarities which might otherwise be noteworthy can be explained in terms of the Anglo-American influence on the library policies of both institutions, and will probably be found in other countries where this influence is as strong. Also, we must subtract the author's influence from both organizations since it was temporary and personal.

One a glance over the data presented above is needed to reveal that the two libraries' serial selection policies were more different than alike. Of course, their sponsoring organizations were different in many ways, also. Of course, this plentitude of differences makes comparative analysis simpler, but leaves few similarities for serious consideration, also.

It is easy to pick out a few minor areas in which Drexel-Irandoc policies were similar, but often it is unclear whether or not these areas were professionally or socially significant. An example is the importance of library and information science serial material to both organizations. Each one was concerned with serving a library school and with providing a good collection of material in its professional staff members' own field. Both felt obligated to develop the develop the best library and information science collections in their geographic areas. In neither case was there another such strong and active collection nearby. What serial or professional variables was this factor associated with? It seems to have related to the absence of any other organization which could be depended on to provide this literature. Further, since their own subject field was increasing rapidly in complexity and breadth, each set of staff members felt a practical need to acquire its literature conscientiously and maintain contact with new professional ideas. In each country, most libraries were specialized by subject field or else by scholarly level, and library science was not one of their immediate concerns. Finally, it is clear that some modern librarians tended to look after their own interests first when building a serial collection.

Another similarity worth noting was each organization's consciousness of the importance of depending on other organizations for serial service assistance. They carried on some inter-library loan activity and were reasonably content to allow serial selection to be limited budgetarily in the knowledge that many titles could be borrowed from other libraries. Each organization was aware of modern information systems and network thinking and of the increasing dependence on each other of nations and people generally as well as libraries individually. Of course,

such ideas can be found in every country and organization where cooperation and modern information thinking are well-known. Probably Drexel and Irandoc were influenced generally by the Anglo-American library concepts dominant in both countries.

In surveying other minor similarities, we might mention the rather remarkable estimate for the serial subscription list overlap, 33%. In this respect, probably the desire for American serials in many of the same subject fields brought the two institutions together. American serials were of relatively high quality, and most of the serial index and abstract services in which they were covered were American titles, also. No doubt the presence of American influence in both organizations was a cause of further similarities.

Finally, we come to what seems to be the most significant Drexel-Irandoc similarity, that, first and foremost, each library bought local serials. By local serials is meant primarily material from each library's own country, but secondarily, material from each library's own city. Within its subject fields, Irandoc's coverage of Iranian, particularly of Tehran titles, was comprehensive, while at the same time Drexel's coverage of American titles was as comprehensive as its budget would allow. Certainly, Drexel's coverage of Philadelphia titles was quite good, also, probably better than that of any non-Philadelphia library.

Why was such localism a common characteristic between these two organizations? This similarity must relate to the librarian's concern for serving his local clientele well, and part of such service required selection of a large number of local serial titles. Probably such a concern was common in many countries. In most libraries, certain local serials could be expected to rank among the library's most popular titles. Often, this popularity was due to user familiarity with them and to their inclusion of interesting local personal and institutional papers and news. The desire to keep up with events and people in the immediate vicinity was an important motive. Of course, localism was a part of heritage preservation and of the nationalistic approach to librarianship generally. In each country, familiarity related strongly to language fluency, also, and perhaps even, to some extent, to the higher cost and delayed receipt of most foreign material. The ease of obtaining local material as contrasted with the difficulty of obtaining foreign material was another influential factor in both countries. Drexel would have had difficulty defending the idea of bringing in large numbers of foreign titles in preference to high quality American subscriptions. It was the opposite in Iran, however, with the Iranian librarian's lack of pride

in contemporary Iran sometimes leading him to ignore the much lower quality local material. In spite of this ambivalence toward Iran, there was a logical reason why many Iranian titles could be found in Irandoc's collection. Irandoc's exhaustive coverage of them was not due to a high opinion of their [illegible] but to its assumption of responsibility for indexing, abstracting and preserving them, in the absence of other libraries carrying out this function.

What can be the final conclusion of this comparison? Regrettably, the absence of the data and analyses needed to support an objective study have severly limited its effectiveness. Briefly, however, two conclusions may be listed. The influence of nationalism on serial subscription policies in Iran and America must be recognized. Probably it is common in libraries over the world to find large numbers of local titles on hand. Also, whenever local pride or nationalism and strong library service ideas are combined, then a rich representation of local serials may be expected, as a way of providing good service to local users.

6.29.71